PLAINTIFFS' TRIAL REQUEST FOR JUDICIAL NOTICE

28

4835-6812-5698.1

1

2

3

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

23

24

25

26

27

28

TO DEFENDANTS AND THEIR ATTORNEYS OF RECORD:

Pursuant to Rule 201 of the Federal Rules of Evidence, Plaintiffs TRAFFICSCHOOL.COM, INC. and DRIVERS ED DIRECT, LLC., ("Plaintiffs") request that the Court take judicial notice of the following documents and facts:

1. Exhibit A and content therein: (Certified Copy of the record from the United States Patent and Trademark Office regarding the April 24, 2007 Opposition Filed by the State of California's Department of Motor Vehicles to eDriver, Inc.'s trademark application for the DMV.ORG mark).

Federal Rule of Evidence 201(b) permits judicial notice of facts "not subject to reasonable dispute" in that they are "either (1) generally known within the territorial jurisdiction or the trial court or (2) capable of accurate and ready determination by resort to sources whose accuracy cannot reasonably be questioned."

This request is proper as courts have taken judicial notice of "records and reports of administrative bodies" Interstate Natural Gas Co. v. Southern California Gas Co., 209 F.2d 380, 385 (9th Cir. 1953)); See also Denius v. Dunlap, 330 F.3d 919, 926 (7th Cir. 2003) (stating that court may take judicial notice of information at government agency's website); Snyder v. Enterprise Rent-A-Car Co. of San Francisco (ERAC-SF), 392 F.Supp.2d 1116, 1120 (N.D.Cal. 2005)(the court granted requests for judicial notice of the records of the Department of Motor Vehicles ("DMV"); See Shaghoian v. Aghajani, 228 F.Supp.2d 1107, 1109 n. 4 (C.D.Cal. 2002) (taking judicial notice of DMV records).

DATED: Nov. 8, 2007

LEWIS BRISBOIS BISGAARD & SMITH LLP

ttorneys forPlaintiffs

AFFICSCHOOL.COM, INC. and

DRIVERS ED DIRECT. LLC.



INTER UNION DED STAVIDES OF AN OPER CA

TO ALL TO WHOM THESE: PRESENTS SHALL COME:

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office

October 26, 2007

THIS IS TO CERTIFY THAT ANNEXED IS A TRUE COPY FROM THE RECORDS OF THIS OFFICE OF THE FILE WRAPPER AND CONTENTS OF:

TRADEMARK OPPOSITION NUMBER: 91/176,917

1666012

By Authority of the

Under Secretary of Commerce for Intellectual Property and Director of the United States Patent and Trademark Office

TOTAL SEE (1)

M. K. CARTER
Certifying Officer

ESTTA Tracking number:

ESTTA137220

Filing date:

04/24/2007

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE BEFORE THE TRADEMARK TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

Notice of Opposition

Notice is hereby given that the following party opposes registration of the indicated application.

Opposer Information

Name	Department of Motor Vehicles, State of California
Granted to Date of previous extension	04/28/2007
Address	Legal Office, M/S E128 P.O. Box 932382 Sacramento, CA 94232-3820 UNITED STATES

Correspondence	Christopher J. Gill
information	Senior Staff Counsel
1	Department of Motor Vehicles, State of California
	Legal Office, M/S E128 P.O. Box 932382
	Sacramento, CA 94232-3820
	UNITED STATES
	cgill@dmv.ca.gov Phone:916-657-6469

Applicant Information

Application No	78777105	Publication date	02/27/2007	
Opposition Filing Date	04/24/2007	Opposition Period Ends	04/28/2007	
Applicant		eDriver, Inc. #591 9663 SANTA MONICA BLVD Beverly Hills, CA 90210		

Goods/Services Affected by Opposition

Class 035. First Use: 1999/03/02 First Use In Commerce: 1999/06/00
All goods and sevices in the class are opposed, namely: Advertising and commercial information

services, via the internet; Advertising and marketing

Grounds for Opposition

Deceptiveness	Trademark Act section 2(a)
False suggestion of a connection	Trademark Act section 2(a)
Priority and likelihood of confusion	Trademark Act section 2(d)
The mark is merely descriptive	Trademark Act section 2(e)(1)
The mark is deceptively misdescriptive	Trademark Act section 2(e)(1)
The mark is primarily geographically descriptive	Trademark Act section 2(e)(2)
The mark is primarily geographically deceptively misdescriptive	Trademark Act section 2(e)(3)
The mark comprises matter that, as a whole, is	Trademark Act section 2(e)(5)

functional	
Genericness	Trademark Act section 23
Other	15 USCS Secs. 1052(a), (d), (e)(1), and (e)(5); 15 USCS Secs. 1125(a)(1)(A) and (a)(1)(B).

Mark Cited by Opposer as Basis for Opposition

U.S. Application/ Registration No.	NONE	Application Date	NONE
Registration Date	NONE		
Word Mark	DMV (Department of Motor Vehicles)		
Goods/Services	Regulation of driver licensing, vehicle registration, and occupational licensees, including the oversight of licensed driver education schools. Publishes and disseminates various materials related to the licensing of California drivers and the registration of vehicles in this State, including the operation and maintenance of an official governmental web site (www.dmv.ca.gov).		

Attachments	DMV org Opposition2.pdf (1 page)(32787 bytes)	
Signature	/Christopher J. Gill/	
Name	Christopher J. Gill	
Date	04/24/2007	

Summary of Opposition of the California Department of Motor Vehicles:

- 1. The use of "dmv.org" by a private entity violates 15 USCS Section 1125(a)(1) in that this designation falsely implies a connection or association with governmental entities that are commonly known throughout the country as the "DMV" and/or "Department of Motor Vehicles".
- 2. Use of "DMV" by a private entity is likely to cause confusion or mistake, or create the appearance that the trademark holder is sponsored or approved by a governmental entity, in violation of 15 USCS Section 1125(a)(1)(A). (See Cotrell, Ltd. v. Biotrol Int'l, Inc. 191 F.3d 1248, 1255-56 (7th Cir. 1999); Summit Tech, Inc. v. High-Line Med. Instruments, Co. 933 F.Supp. 918 (C.D.Cal. 1996).
- 3. By using "DMV" in a commercial manner/advertisement, the proposed trademark misrepresents the characteristics, qualities and/or origins of the advertised goods and services. (See <u>Waits v. Frito-Lay, Inc.</u>, 978 F.2d 1093, 1108 (9th Cir. 1992).
- 4. Use of a trademark that is commonly used by governmental agencies is likely to cause public confusion, could result in the dissemination of inaccurate information about California legal requirements and, therefore, will adversely impact the ability of the State of California to administer and enforce its motor vehicle and related laws.
- 5. 15 USCS Section 1052(a) prohibits the registration of a trademark when it consists of a designation that is deceptive or falsely suggests a connection with an institution, including governmental institutions. In this instance, the proposed trademark "DMV.org" deceptively implies a connection with governmental regulatory agencies, including the California Department of Motor Vehicles or "DMV".
- 6. The proposed trademark would violate 15 USCS Section 1052(a)(d) in that it so resembles the "DMV" designation used for decades in California and other states that it is likely to cause confusion, mistake, or to deceive. The proposed mark closely mirrors the official web site of the California DMV, which is "www.dmv.ca.gov". California and approximately 21 other states use the designation "DMV" in their title and/or official publications.
- 7. The proposed trademark would violate 15 USCS Section 1052(e)(1) in that the phrase "DMV" is merely descriptive (and/or deceptively descriptive).
- 8. The proposed trademark would violate 15 USCS Section 1052(e)(5) in that the phrase, as a whole, is merely functional.

United States Patent and Trademark Office Trademark Trial and Appeal Board P.O. Box 1451 Alexandria, VA 22313-1451

Mailed: April 24, 2007

Opposition No 91176917 Serial No. 78777105

R. JOSEPH TROJAN
TROJAN LAW OFFICES
9250 WILSHIRE BLVD STE 325
BEVERLY HILLS, CA 90212-3376
trojan@trojanlawoffices.com

Department of Motor Vehicles, State of California

ν.

eDriver, Inc.

Christopher J. Gill
Department of Motor Vehicles, State of California
Legal Office, M/S E128P.O. Box 932382
Sacramento, CA 94232-3820
cgill@dmv.ca.gov

ESTTA137220

A notice of opposition to the registration sought in the aboveidentified application has been filed. The notice of opposition can be viewed and printed at http://ttabvue.uspto.gov/ttabvue/v?qs=91176917

ANSWER IS DUE FORTY DAYS after the transmission date hereof. (See Trademark Rule 2.196 for expiration date falling on Saturday, Sunday or a holiday).

Proceedings will be conducted in accordance with the Trademark Rules of Practice, set forth in Title 37, part 2, of the Code of Federal Regulations. The parties are reminded of the recent amendments to the Trademark Rules that affect the rules of practice before the TTAB. See Rules of Practice for Trademark-Related Filings Under the Madrid Protocol Implementation Act, 68 Fed. R. 55,748 (September 26, 2003) (effective November 2, 2003); Reorganization of Correspondence and Other Provisions, 68 Fed. Reg. 48,286 (August 13, 2003) (effective September 12, 2003). Notices concerning the rules changes, as well as the Trademark Trial and Appeal Board Manual of Procedure (TBMP), are available at www.uspto.gov/web/offices/dcom/ttab/.

The parties are particularly referred to Trademark Rule 2.126 pertaining to the form of submissions. Paper submissions, including but not limited to exhibits and depositions, not filed in accordance

with Trademark Rule 2.126 may not be given consideration or entered into the case file.

Discovery and testimony periods are set as follows:

Discovery period to open:

May 14, 2007

Discovery period to close:

November 10, 2007

30-day testimony period for party in position of plaintiff to close:

February 08, 2008

30-day testimony period for party in position of defendant to close:

April 08, 2008

15-day rebuttal testimony period for plaintiff to close:

May 23, 2008

A party must serve on the adverse party a copy of the transcript of any testimony taken during the party's testimony period, together with copies of documentary exhibits, within 30 days after completion of the taking of such testimony. See Trademark Rule 2.125.

Briefs shall be filed in accordance with Trademark Rule 2.128(a) and (b). An oral hearing will be set only upon request filed as provided by Trademark Rule 2.129.

NOTE: The Board allows parties to utilize telephone conferences to discuss or resolve many interlocutory matters that arise in inter partes cases. See the Official Gazette notice titled "Permanent Expansion of Telephone Conferencing on Interlocutory Matters in Inter Partes Cases Before the Trademark Trial and Appeal Board," 1235 TMOG 68 (June 20, 2000). The notice is available at http://www.uspto.gov. Interlocutory matters which the Board agrees to discuss or decide by phone conference may be decided adversely to any party which fails to participate.

If the parties to this proceeding are also parties to other Board proceedings involving related marks or, during the pendency of this proceeding, they become parties to such proceedings, they should notify the Board immediately, so that the Board can consider consolidation of proceedings.

New Developments at the Trademark Trial and Appeal Board

TTAB forms for electronic filing of extensions of time to oppose, notices of opposition, and inter partes filings are now available at http://estta.uspto.gov. Images of TTAB proceeding files can be viewed using TTABVue at http://ttabvue.uspto.gov.

Trademark Trial and Appeal Board Electronic Filing System. http://estta.uspto.gov

ESTTA Tracking number:

ESTTA144244

Filing date:

06/05/2007

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE BEFORE THE TRADEMARK TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

Proceeding	91176917
Party	Defendant eDriver, Inc. eDriver, Inc. #591 9663 SANTA MONICA BLVD Beverly Hills, CA 90210
Correspondence Address	R. JOSEPH TROJAN TROJAN LAW OFFICES 9250 WILSHIRE BLVD STE 325 BEVERLY HILLS, CA 90212-3376 trojan@trojanlawoffices.com
Submission	Withdrawal Of Application
Filer's Name	Lauren Mirsky
Filer's e-mail	trojan@trojanlawoffices.com
Signature	/Lauren Mirsky/
Date	06/05/2007
Attachments	dmv.org express abandonment.pdf (1 page)(76127 bytes)

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE BEFORE THE TRADEMARK TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

Department of Motor Vehicles, State of California) Opposition No. 91176917 Re: DMV.ORG Serial No.: 78/777105
Opposer,)
v.) REQEUST FOR EXPRESS ABANDONMENT
eDriver, Inc.,)))
Applicant.) _)

CERTIFICATE OF TRANSMISSION

I hereby certify that this paper is being transmitted to the Trademark Trial and Appeal Board via ESTAA on the date shown below.

Lauren Mirsky Date

/Lauren Mirsky/ June 5, 2007

REQUEST FOR EXPRESS ABANDONMENT

Applicant hereby expressly abandons U.S. Trademark Application Serial Number 78/777105.

Date: June 5, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

/Lauren Mirsky/
R. Joseph Trojan
Lauren Mirsky
Trojan Law Offices
9250 Wilshire Blvd., Suite 325
Beverly Hills, CA 90212

Attorneys for Applicant eDriver, Inc.

Trademark Trial and Appeal Board Electronic Filing System. http://estta.uspto.gov

Filing date:

ESTTA Tracking number:

ESTTA146218

06/15/2007

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE BEFORE THE TRADEMARK TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

Proceeding	91176917
Party	Defendant eDriver, Inc. eDriver, Inc. #591 9663 SANTA MONICA BLVD Beverly Hills, CA 90210
Correspondence Address	R. JOSEPH TROJAN TROJAN LAW OFFICES 9250 WILSHIRE BLVD STE 325 BEVERLY HILLS, CA 90212-3376 trojan@trojanlawoffices.com
Submission	Other Motions/Papers
Filer's Name	Lauren Mirsky
Filer's e-mail	trojan@trojanlawoffices.com, mirsky@trojanlawoffices.com
Signature	/Lauren Mirsky/
Date	06/15/2007
Attachments	PS DVD WORLD TTAB .pdf (1 page)(76395 bytes)

PROOF OF SERVICE I am over the age of 18 years, employed in the County of Los Angeles, and not a party to the above entitled action. My business address is 9250 Wilshire Blvd., Suite 325, Beverly Hills, 3 California 90212. On June 15, 2007, I served: 5 REQUEST FOR EXPRESS ABANDONMENT 6 by transmitting to: Christopher J. Gill 8 Department of Motor Vehicles, State of California Legal Office, M/S E128P.O. Box 932382 Sacramento, CA 94232-3820 10 Fax 916-657-6243 cgill@dmv.ca.gov 11 [X] BY FACSIMILE: I caused a copy of such document to be sent via facsimile machine to the 12 office of the addressee(s) at the phone number shown above. 13 [X] BY MAIL: I am readily familiar with the firm's practice of collection and processing 14 correspondence for mailing. Under that practice it would be deposited with the U.S. Postal Service on the same day with postage thereon fully prepaid at Beverly Hills, California, in the 15 ordinary course of business. I am aware that on the motion of the party served, service is presumed invalid if the postal cancellation date or postage meter date is more than one day after 16 the date of deposit for mailing shown on this proof of service. 17 [X] FEDERAL: I declare, under penalty of perjury under the laws of the United States that the foregoing is true and that I am employed in the office of a member of the bar of this Court at 18 whose direction the service was made. 19 Executed on June 15, 2007 at Beverly Hills, California. 20 21 Michiko Speier 22 23 24 25 26 27 28

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE Trademark Trial and Appeal Board P.O. Box 1451
Alexandria, VA 22313-1451

jh

Mailed: July 18, 2007

Opposition No. 91176917

Department of Motor Vehicles, State of California

ν.

eDriver, Inc.

On June 5, 2007, applicant filed an abandonment of its application Serial No. 78777105.1

Trademark Rule 2.135 provides that if, in an inter partes proceeding, the applicant files an abandonment without the written consent of every adverse party to the proceeding, judgment shall be entered against applicant.

In view thereof, and because opposer's written consent to the abandonment is not of record, judgment is hereby entered against applicant, the opposition is sustained and registration to applicant is refused.

By the Trademark Trial and Appeal Board

¹ Applicant's proof of service of its abandonment on opposer filed June 15, 2007 is noted.

PROOF OF SERVICE

Trafficschool.com, Inc. v. Edriver, Inc. - File No. 25162.14

STATE OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES

I am employed in the County of Los Angeles, State of California. I am over the age of 18 and not a party to the within action. My business address is 221 N. Figueroa Street, Suite 1200, Los Angeles, California, 90012.

On Nov. 8, 2007, I served the following document described as **PLAINTIFFS REQUEST FOR JUDICIAL NOTICE** AT TRIAL on all interested parties in this action by placing [X] hand delivery and email to:

Brian M. Daucher, Esq. Joseph H. Tadros, Esq. <u>bdaucher@sheppardmullin.com</u> <u>itadros@sheppardmullin.com</u>

[X] (FEDERAL) I declare that I am employed in the office of a member of the bar of this Court at whose direction the service was made.

Executed on November 8, 2007 at Los Angeles, California.

MINA HAMILTON

3